IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 37605

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 694
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: November 3, 2010
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
DARYL EUGENE RAYMOND,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Robert C. Naftz, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, a repeated offense, <u>affirmed</u>.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

_____

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

_____

PER CURIAM

Daryl Eugene Raymond pled guilty to driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, a repeated offense. Idaho Code §§ 18-8004 and 18-8005(7). The district court sentenced Raymond to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. Raymond appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-

15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

 Therefore, Raymond's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.